

Alizabeth Rasmussen

June 10, 2006

Federal Trade Commission/Office of the Secretary, Room H-135 (Annex W)  
Re: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20580  
RE: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing this letter because I am concerned about the proposed Business Opportunity Rule R511993. I believe that in its present form, it could prevent me from continuing as an Independent Sunrider Distributor. I understand that part of the FTC's responsibilities is to protect the public from "unfair and deceptive acts or practices," but some of the sections in the proposed rule will make it very difficult if not impossible for me to continue my business.

One of the most confusing and burdensome sections of the proposed rule is the seven-day waiting period to enroll new Distributors. Sunrider's Starter Pack costs only \$140, and is not a mandatory purchase in order to become an Independent Sunrider Distributor. People buy TVs, cars, and other items that cost much more than that and they do not have to wait seven days. Many people who have no intention of building a business with Sunrider sign up as Distributors because they enjoy the products and want to receive the lowest price possible. It does not make sense that their product purchases should have to be delayed by a week in order to comply with these proposed regulations. For those who do want to sign up with the intention of building a business, this waiting period gives the impression that there might be something wrong with the plan. I think this seven-day waiting period is unnecessary because Sunrider already has a generous 60-day return policy for existing Distributors that is applicable to all products, including the Sunrider® Starter Pack. Sunrider also has a 90% buyback policy for former Distributors applicable to all products purchased within the last twelve months.

The proposed rule also calls for the release of **any** information regarding lawsuits involving misrepresentation, or unfair or deceptive practices. It does not matter if the company was found innocent. Today, anyone or any company can be sued for almost anything. It does not make sense to me that I would have to disclose these lawsuits unless Sunrider is found guilty. Otherwise, Sunrider and I are put at an unfair advantage even though Sunrider has done **nothing** wrong.

Finally, the proposed rule requires the disclosure of a minimum of 10 prior purchasers nearest to the prospective purchaser. I am glad to provide references, but in this day of identity theft, I am very uncomfortable giving out the personal information of individuals (without their approval) to strangers. In addition, giving away this information could damage the business relationship of the references who may be involved in other companies or businesses including those of competitors. In order to get the list of the 10 prior purchasers, I will need to send the address of the prospective purchaser to Sunrider headquarters and then wait for the list. I also think the

following sentence required by the proposed rule will prevent many people from wanting to sign up as a salesperson: “If you buy a business opportunity from the seller, your contact information can be disclosed in the future to other buyers.” People are very concerned about their privacy and identity theft. They will be reluctant to share their personal information with individuals they may have never met.

I have been an Independent Sunrider Distributor for almost three years. Originally, I became a Distributor of Sunrider’s products because I like them and wanted to earn some additional money. Now my family depends on this extra income to supplement our budget. In building my business, I do not hype people up or try to convince them to do anything that they do not want to do. I simply provide information and an overview of how the compensation plan works. My business involves supporting people to meet their goals of health and financial freedom, but I do not make claims about how successful someone will be, because that is up to each individual.

I appreciate the work of the FTC to protect consumers, and I understand that there are companies out there who do not act with integrity. But I believe this proposed new rule has many unintended consequences and that there are less burdensome alternatives available.

Thank you for your time in considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Alizabeth Rasmussen